Imperial/TP/2014/CC/1
UMN–TH–3331/14
ACFI-T14-07

arXiv:1403.4596v2 [astro-ph.CO] 24 Mar 2014

Suppressing the impact of a high tensor-to-scalar ratio on the temperature anisotropies

Carlo R. Contaldi[1,2], Marco Peloso[3], Lorenzo Sorbo[4,5]

[1] *Theoretical Physics, Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London, SW7 2BZ, UK*
[2] *Canadian Institute of Theoretical Physics, Toronto, M5S 3H8, On, Canada*
[3] *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 55455, USA*
[4] *Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA*
[5] *Institut de Physique Théorique, CEA, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France*

(Dated: March 2014)

The BICEP2 collaboration has reported a strong B mode signal in the CMB polarization, which is well fit by a tensor-to-scalar ratio of $r \simeq 0.2$. This is greater than the upper limit $r < 0.11$ obtained from the temperature anisotropies under the assumption of a constant scalar spectral index n_s. This discrepancy can be reduced once the statistical error and the contamination from polarized dust are accounted for. If however a large value for r will be confirmed, it will need to be reconciled with the temperature anisotropies data. The most advocated explanation involves a variation of n_s with scales (denoted as running) that has a magnitude significantly greater than the generic slow roll predictions. We instead study the possibility that the large scale temperature anisotropies are not enhanced because (1) of a suppression of the scalar power at large scales, or (2) of an anti-correlation between tensor and scalar modes. The first possibility can be achieved for instance by a sudden change of the speed of the inflaton, and we show that it fits the temperature anisotropies and polarization data considerably better than a constant running (its χ^2 improves by ~ 10 over that of the constant running, at the cost of adding two more parameters to the standard model rather than one); the second possibility requires breaking of Lorentz invariance, and it also lead to violation of statistical isotropy in the temperature data, which is (i) of $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ or less, and (ii) present only at large scales. Interestingly, violation of statistical isotropy with these two properties appears to be present both in the WMAP and Planck data.

I. INTRODUCTION

The BICEP2 experiment [1] has observed a B-mode polarization of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) that can be well fit by a lensed-ΛCDM + tensor theoretical model, with tensor-to-scalar ratio $r = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$, with $r = 0$ disfavored at 7σ. It is possible that the actual primordial component of the B-mode found by BICEP2 is smaller than $r = 0.2$. A number of tests were performed on the BICEP2 data to ensure that the the observed value is not due to any instrumental effects. Moreover, the lensing contribution to B-modes does not appear to be sufficiently large to explain the measured value. The signal, observed by BICEP2, peaks at $\ell \approx 100$, where the primordial signal is expected to dominate, whilst the lensing signal peaks at $\ell \approx 1000$.

Other potential contaminants are the Galactic synchrotron and polarized-dust emission. Whilst the former effect is negligible at the BICEP2 observing frequency, the polarized dust is a substantial contaminant. Although the area of sky probed by BICEP2 is very clean with respect to the total intensity emission by dust there is still much uncertainty in the level of polarised dust contamination due to the lack of observations. A number of models were considered by BICEP2 for the subtraction of the dust contamination which result in some shift in the maximum likelihood values in r. However the strongest argument for the primordial nature of the signal is that cross-correlation between frequencies displays little change in the observed amplitude. This is an indication that frequency dependent foregrounds are not the dominant contributor to the observed B-modes. The data already collected by Planck should have the sensitivity and frequency range to definitely confirm the

primordial nature of such a large signal.

If the primordial contribution to the $B-$modes is confirmed, it will represent the first detection of gravity waves from inflation [1]. This is of paramount importance, since - under the assumption that the observed gravity waves are those created by a period of quasi de-Sitter inflationary expansion (namely that $P_t \sim V/M_p^4$, where P_t is the tensor power spectrum, $V^{1/4}$ is the energy scale of inflation, and $M_p \simeq 2.4\times 10^{18}$ GeV is the reduced Planck mass) - it allows us, for the first time, to determine the energy scale of inflation. From the parametrization $r \equiv P_t/P_s$, and from the measured value of the scalar power spectrum, $P_s \simeq 2.45 \times 10^{-9}$, one obtains the well known relation

$$V^{1/4} \simeq 2.25 \cdot 10^{16}\,\mathrm{GeV}\,\left(\frac{r}{0.2}\right)^{1/4}\,. \tag{1}$$

Therefore, if the B-mode signal observed by BICEP2 is due to inflationary vacuum modes, we have now learnt that inflation took place at the GUT scale.

Taken at face value, the BICEP2 value is in strong tension with the 2σ limit $r < 0.11$ obtained by the Planck inflation analysis [2]. Such a limit however relies on the scaling of the temperature anisotropy data (supplemented by the WMAP large-scale polarization likelihood), and not on the direct measurement of the B-mode polarization. The $r < 0.11$ limit appears robust under the inclusion of several data sets (such as the ACT+SPT temperature data, BAO, and the Planck lensing [2]). However, it crucially relies in the assumption of a constant spectral tilt n_s.

Specifically, it is obtained from the Planck+ACT+SPT temperature data (with the Planck data supplemented by the WMAP large-scale polarization likelihood), under the assumption of constant spectral tilt $n_s = 0.960 \pm 0.007$ [2]. As discussed in [2], a more relaxed limit is obtained if n_s is allowed to vary with scale k. Specifically, it is customary to parametrize the scalar power spectrum as

$$P_\zeta\left(k\right) \equiv P\left(k_0\right)\left(\frac{k}{k_0}\right)^{n_s-1+\frac{1}{2}\alpha_s \ln\frac{k}{k_0}}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $k_0 = 0.05$ Mpc^{-1}, is the chosen pivot scale (this is the scale at which also r is defined) and the parameter α_s denotes the running of the scalar spectral tilt [3] with $\alpha_s = \frac{d\,n_s}{d\ln k}$.

If $\alpha_s \neq 0$, the $r < 0.11$ limit is relaxed to $r \lesssim 0.25$. From Figure 5 of [2] we infer that a value $\alpha_s \sim -0.02$ is required to reconcile the temperature data with $r = 0.2$. Such a large value of $|\alpha_s|$ is not a generic prediction of slow roll inflationary models. Indeed, in terms of the slow roll parameters

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{M_p^2}{2}\left(\frac{V_{,\phi}}{V}\right)^2\,,\ \eta \equiv M_p^2\frac{V_{,\phi\phi}}{V}\,,\ \xi^2 \equiv M_p^4\frac{V_{,\phi}V_{,\phi\phi\phi}}{V^2}\,, \tag{3}$$

where V denotes the potential of the inflaton ϕ and comma denotes a derivative, we have the well known slow roll relations

$$\begin{aligned} &r = 16\,\epsilon \quad,\quad n_s - 1 = 2\eta - 6\epsilon\,,\\ &\alpha_s = -2\xi^2 + \frac{r}{2}\left(n_s - 1\right) + \frac{3}{32}r^2 \simeq -2\xi^2 - 0.00025\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $n_s = 0.96$, $r = 0.2$ has been used in the final numerical estimate. This is typically much smaller than the required value, since, as evident in (4), the running is generically of second order in slow roll.

In principle, models can be constructed in which the third derivative term ξ^2 is "anomalously large". However, besides being hard to motivate, it is difficult to maintain a large third derivative, while the first two derivatives are small, for a sufficiently long duration of inflation, [4, 5], so that the models in which a large running is achieved have potentials with some bump-like feature or superimposed oscillations [4, 6–9], or possess some peculiar aspects beyond standard scenarios [10–14].

In summary, it appears that $r = 0.2$ can be reconciled with the limits from the temperature anisotropies through a negative running, which is however of substantially larger magnitude than the generic slow roll prediction. It is possible that the value of r from the polarization will shift towards $r \sim 0.1$, in which case the tension with the temperature data can be relaxed (or disappear altogether). This can happen factoring in both the statistical uncertainty in the BICEP2 $r = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$ result, and the decrease of r that appears in most of the model-dependent dust corrections [1].

Remarkably, r close to 0.15 appears as a prediction of the simplest models of inflation, such as chaotic inflation [15] and natural inflation [16]. Even if UV complete theories typically leads to a lower inflationary scale, it is possible to construct models that can evade the fundamental constraints which typically make high-scale inflation difficult to realize [17–20] and still display such simple potentials.

However, from a theoretical point of view, it is interesting to understand the implications that a large measured value for r from polarization would have for inflationary model building. In this work we discuss two additional possibilities (in addition to the already mentioned running of the spectral tilt) to suppress the large scale temperature signal in presence of a large $r \simeq 0.2$.

The first mechanism relies on the presence of a large scale suppression in the scalar power, that we parametrize with a step function. A similar idea was already explored in [21], in order to address the suppressed power of the temperature anisotropies at the largest scales. The best fit to the first year WMAP data was obtained if the power drops to zero at scales $k \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ [22]. Such a strong suppression can for example occur if the universe is closed, with a curvature radius comparable to the horizon at the onset of inflation [23], or if the inflaton was in fast roll at the

beginning of the last ~ 60 e-folds of inflation [21]. In this case, one also expects a suppression of the tensor signal at large scales, although this suppression is milder than that of the scalar power [24]. Here, for simplicity, we only consider a simple model for suppression in order to explore the viability of such a model in explaining the surprisingly discrepancy between TT and BB spectra. We do not assume that the power drastically drops to $\simeq 0$ at large scales, but that it decreases by a factor β_s in a step-like manner for k smaller than a given scale k_*. Our best fit is characterized by only a partial drop ($\beta_s \sim 0.65$) and it can be achieved for example by a change of slope of the inflaton potential (such that the inflaton goes slightly faster when the largest modes were generated) or by a change of the sound speed of the inflaton perturbations [25].

The second possibility that we discuss is a negative correlation between the scalar and tensor signal. This correlation will reduce the sum of the scalar and tensor modes on the temperature anisotropy. In principle, a very strong anti-correlation at the largest observable scales could even result in a decreased temperature amplitude in the presence of a significant tensor signal. A non-vanishing scalar-tensor correlation requires the breaking of Lorentz invariance, and for example it arises if the background expansion is anisotropic [26–29].

The plan of the paper is the following: In Section II we discuss the effects of a large scale suppression of the scalar power. In Section III we discuss the effects of an anti-correlation between scalar and tensor modes. We conclude with a discussion in Section IV.

II. SUPPRESSION OF LARGE SCALE SCALAR MODES

To show how a model with large-scale suppression of scalar modes can reconcile the TT data observed by Planck and of B-modes observed by BICEP2 without resorting to running of the spectral index we implement a simple ansatz for the suppression of scalar power on large scales in the primordial curvature spectrum

$$P_\zeta(k) = \beta_s \, A \, k^{n_s - 1} \,, \tag{5}$$

with $A \equiv P(k_0)$ and a suppression factor β_s that takes the value $\beta_s = 1$ for $k \geq k_\star$ and $\beta_s < 1$ for $k < k_\star$. The tensor primordial spectrum is unchanged from its canonical form with $P_h = r \, A \, k^{n_t}$ everywhere.

Using a modified version of the `CAMB`[30] package we calculate the total contribution to the TT spectrum from both scalar and tensor modes and the tensor contribution to the BB spectrum. The total contribution can then be fit to the combined Planck+WP+BICEP2 data set that include Planck TT data, WMAP9 polarisation data, and the new BICEP2 results. We do this by employing a modified version of `CosmoMC` [31] with extra parameters $k_\star$ and β_s included. For simplicity we carry out a MCMC exploration of the reduced parameter space spanned by



FIG. 1. The total contribution to the TT spectrum from scalar and tensors. The black (solid) curve shows the best-fit suppression model with fixed $r = 0.2$ from the MCMC chains. The tensor contribution compensates for the loss of large-scale scalar power but also allows a better fit to the low points in the range $20 < \ell < 30$. The red (dashed) model is the best-fit model from the "base r" Planck+WP MCMC runs with $r = 0.004$.

τ the optical depth to reionization, n_s the scalar spectral index, $\ln(10^{10}A)$ the logarithm of the primordial curvature perturbation, r the tensor-to-scalar ratio, $k_\star$, and β_s and keep all other cosmological and nuisance parameters fixed to the best-fit values of the "base r" Planck+WP run reported in [32]. The "base r" ΛCDM + tensor model will be the reference model for fit comparison. We adopt uniform prior ranges for the four parameters with $\tau = [0.01, 0.8]$, $n_s = [0.9, 1.1]$, $\ln(10^{10}A) = [2.7, 4]$, $r = [0, 0.8]$, $k_\star = [0, 0.15]$, and $\beta_s = [0, 1.5]$. We also compare to the ΛCDM + tensor + α_s model which has been highlighted as a way to reconcile the high tensor amplitude with the TT data. All runs include lensing effects when calculating model C_ℓs.

Figure 1 shows the total (scalar + tensor) contribution to the TT spectrum for the best-fit model obtain by Planck in their "base r" run [32], with $r = 0.004$. This fit was obtained with the Planck+WP combination only. We compare this with the best-fit suppression model for the Planck+WP+BICEP2 data combination. The best-fit suppression parameters are $k_\star = 0.0027$ Mpc^{-1}, $\beta_s = 0.65$, and the best-fit tensor-to-scalar ratio is $r = 0.21$. The suppression model has the freedom to obtain a better fit than the conventional ΛCDM + tensor run by fitting the low power observed at $\ell < 30$. In particular the model allows a better fit to the low cluster of points in the range $20 < \ell < 30$. Including the BICEP2 results in the ΛCDM + tensor fit forces the tensor amplitude up to a best-fit value of $r = 0.16$ the effective $\chi^2 = -2 \ln L$ for the best-fit is significantly higher than the best-fit model in the suppression case. Table I shows



FIG. 2. The BB spectra for the same two models shown in Figure 1. The Planck "base r" best-fit model has a B-mode spectrum that is far below the BICEP2 detection, in the unlensed limit $\ell < 100$. The suppression model is compatible with the detection having $r = 0.2$ whilst giving a better fitting TT spectrum. The best-fit parameters for the suppression model are $\beta_s = 0.65$ and $k_\star = 0.0027$ Mpc^{-1}.

Planck+WP+BICEP2	ΔN_p	χ^2	$\Delta\chi^2$	r
ΛCDM + tensor	–	9854.83	–	0.16
ΛCDM + tensor + α_s	+1	9850.14	-4.69	0.17
Suppression	+2	9840.51	-14.32	0.20

TABLE I. Relative changes in effective χ^2 values for the three models considered. The change in number of model parameters with respect to the ΛCDM + tensor model is shown as ΔN_p. The r column shows the best-fit value of the tensor-to-scalar ratio for each case. Only the case with suppressed scalar power can accommodate the observed amplitude of $r \sim 0.2$.

the change in effective χ^2 relative to the ΛCDM + tensor model for fits including the Planck+WP+BICEP2 data combination.

The results show that models with a suppression of scalar power at large scales are favoured with respect to ones that employ running of the scalar spectral index notwithstanding the additional parameter required in the suppression model. Both models do better than the ΛCDM + tensor model but the running case only marginally so given the additional parameter. This is not surprising since the case with running reduces power, for a negative α_s, on scales that are both lower *and* higher than the pivot scale of $k = 0.05$ Mpc^{-1}. The model with running is therefore not a natural one to appeal to if all that is required is to modify the scalar power on large scales.

Figure 2 shows the BB spectra for the same two models as in Figure 1. The spectra include the pure tensor contribution and the contribution from lensing. The BICEP2 data points are included for comparison. The conventional "base r" Planck best-fit model has a very low tensor spectrum which is incompatible with the BICEP2 detection whilst the suppression model has a best-fit value of $r = 0.20$ in agreement with BICEP2.



FIG. 3. The marginalised, normalised, 1 and 2-D posteriors for $k_\star$ and β_s. The parameters are well constrained by the TT data.

The suppression parameters are well constrained by the Planck data, as shown in Figure 3, with marginalised constraints; $k_\star = (4.07^{+0.70}_{-2.45}) \times 10^{-3}$ Mpc^{-1} and $\beta_s = 0.74^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$. The null hypothesis that the suppression is either absent or occurs on scales larger than those observable seems to be ruled out strongly. This indicates that a full Bayesian evidence analysis of such suppression models is warranted by the data. Such studies will quantify the comparison with other explanations for the TT-BB discrepancy such as the inclusion of significant amounts of running in the spectral index and should be explored in the context of concrete models for the suppression such as the mechanisms discussed in [21] and [24].

III. SCALAR-TENSOR ANTICORRELATIONS

Since the temperature fluctuations in the CMB take contributions from both scalar and tensor perturbations whereas the B-modes are sourced only by the latter, it is possible to reduce the temperature power spectrum without affecting the B-mode one by introducing an (anti)correlation between primordial tensors and scalars.

The main advantage of this assumption is that one does not need to break primordial scale invariance to effectively suppress the temperature power spectrum *only at large scales* $\ell \lesssim 100$, where the tensors are not suppressed. On the other hand, such a correlation can be obtained only at the price of breaking Lorentz invariance. As a consequence other CMB observables might be affected by this effect. In particular, it would be interesting to explore possible connections to the large scale anomalies observed in WMAP and Planck. Here we will not study those implications, that we leave for future work, but we focus on the main question of whether, and how, a primordial $\langle \zeta\, h_{ij}\rangle$ correlator can affect the temperature power spectrum.

To get a flavor of the effect we will assume scale invariant primordial correlation functions. We will also assume that the scalars affect the temperature fluctuations only through the Sachs-Wolfe effect.

We define the coefficients

$$C_{lm\,l'm'} \equiv \int \frac{d\mathbf{k}\,d\mathbf{k}'}{(2\pi)^3}\int d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}\,d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}'} \times\langle \frac{\delta T}{T}(\mathbf{k},\,\mathbf{p})^*\,\frac{\delta T}{T}(\mathbf{k}',\,\mathbf{p}')\rangle\, Y_l^m(\mathbf{p})\, Y_{l'}^{m'}(\mathbf{p}')^*\,, \quad (6)$$

where δT will receive contributions both from the scalar perturbations and from the tensors: $\delta T = \delta T^s + \delta T^t$. In the equation above $\mathbf{p}$ is the unit vector directed along the line of sight.

The Sachs-Wolfe contribution is

$$\frac{\delta T^s}{T}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}) \simeq -\frac{1}{5}\zeta(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\tau_0}\,. \quad (7)$$

and a standard calculation gives, for a scale invariant primordial spectrum,

$$C^{s,\,SW}_{lm\,l'm'} = \frac{2\,\pi}{25}\,\frac{\mathcal{P}_\zeta}{l\,(l+1)}\delta_{ll'}\,\delta_{mm'}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is defined by $\langle \zeta(\mathbf{k})^*\,\zeta(\mathbf{k}')\rangle = 2\pi^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta\,\frac{\delta(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')}{k^3}$.

An analogous calculation can be carried for the contribution from tensors $\propto \langle \delta T^t\,\delta T^t\rangle$. The tensor contribution to the temperature fluctuations along the direction $\mathbf{p}$ is, in Fourier space,

$$\frac{\delta T^t(\mathbf{k},\,\mathbf{p})}{T} \simeq -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau_0} d\tau\, e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{p}(\tau_0-\tau)}\,\frac{\partial h_{ij}(\tau,\,\mathbf{k}(\tau))}{\partial\tau}\,p^i\,p^j\,, \quad (9)$$

with (for modes that re-entered the horizon during matter domination)

$$h_{ij}(\tau,\,\mathbf{k}(\tau)) = 3\,\left(\frac{\sin(k\tau)}{(k\tau)^3} - \frac{\cos(k\tau)}{(k\tau)^2}\right)\,h_{ij}(\mathbf{k})\,. \quad (10)$$

where $h_{ij}(\mathbf{k})$ is computed at the end of inflation, where we match boundary conditions with the transfer function. While it is possible in principle to compute exactly the integral in $d\tau$, one can check numerically that the temperature fluctuation is well approximated by

$$\frac{\delta T^t(\mathbf{k},\,\mathbf{p})}{T} \simeq \frac{1}{2}h_{ij}(\mathbf{k})\,e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\tau_0}\,p^i\,p^j\,, \quad (11)$$

where we have used the fact that we are looking at modes well inside our horizon, $k \gg \tau_0^{-1}$.

Then a standard calculation gives again

$$C^t_{lm\,l'm'} = \frac{\pi}{15}\,\frac{\mathcal{P}_t}{(l+3)\,(l-2)}\delta_{ll'}\,\delta_{mm'}, \quad (12)$$

where we have defined $\langle h_{ij}(\mathbf{k})^* h^{ij}(\mathbf{k}')\rangle = 2\pi^2\,\mathcal{P}_t\,\frac{\delta(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')}{k^3}$.

Now let us move to the effect of a primordial scalar-tensor correlation function. The new contribution to $C_{lm\,l'm'}$ reads

$$C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,l'm'} = \int \frac{d\mathbf{k}\,d\mathbf{k}'}{(2\pi)^3}\int d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}\,d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}'} Y_l^m(\mathbf{p})^*\,Y_{l'}^{m'}(\mathbf{p}') \times\left\langle \frac{\delta T^t}{T}(\mathbf{k},\,\mathbf{p})^*\frac{\delta T^s}{T}(\mathbf{k}',\,\mathbf{p}') + \frac{\delta T^s}{T}(\mathbf{k},\,\mathbf{p})^*\frac{\delta T^t}{T}(\mathbf{k}',\,\mathbf{p}')\right\rangle\,. \quad (13)$$

Using eqs. (7) and (11), we see that this is proportional to the correlator between ζ and h_{ij}, that we assume to take the form

$$\langle \zeta(\mathbf{k})^* h_{ij}(\mathbf{k}')\rangle = 2\pi^2\,\frac{\delta(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')}{k^3}\,\Pi_{ij}{}^{ab}(\mathbf{k}')\,\Theta_{ab}\,, \quad (14)$$

where Θ_{ab} is some given constant background tensor. The term $\Pi_{ij}{}^{ab}$ is the projector on the transverse-traceless modes, as required by the tensor nature of h_{ij}: $\Pi_{ij}{}^{ab} = \Pi_i^a\,\Pi_j^b - \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{ij}\,\Pi^{ab}$ with $\Pi_{ab} = \delta_{ab} - \hat{k}_a\hat{k}_b$ and with $\hat{\mathbf{k}} \equiv \mathbf{k}/k$. As a consequence, eq. (13) rewrites

$$C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,l'm'} = -\frac{1}{10}\int\frac{dk}{k}\int\frac{d\Omega_{\hat{\mathbf{k}}}}{4\pi}\,d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}\,d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}'} \times p^i\,p^j\,\Pi_{ij}{}^{ab}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})\,\Theta_{ab}e^{-ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{p}')\,\tau_0}\,Y_l^m(\mathbf{p})^*\,Y_{l'}^{m'}(\mathbf{p}') + (\text{h.c.},\ (lm)\leftrightarrow(l'm'))\,. \quad (15)$$

For simplicity, we assume that $\Theta_{ab} = \sigma\,\mathbf{v}_a\,\mathbf{v}_b$, for some constant vector $\mathbf{v}$ (the generalization to an arbitrary tensor is straightforward) and with $\sigma = \pm 1$. It is then convenient to choose a coordinate system where $\mathbf{v} = (0,\,0,\,v)$.

Now let us deal separately with the various integrals in equation (15). First, using the standard decomposition

$$e^{ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{p}'\tau_0} = \sum_{r'=0}^{\infty}\sum_{s'=-r'}^{r'} 4\pi\,i^{r'}\,j_{r'}(k\tau_0)\,Y_{r'}^{s'}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})^*\,Y_{r'}^{s'}(\mathbf{p}')\,, \quad (16)$$

the integral on $d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}'}$ evaluates to

$$\int d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}'} e^{ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{p}'\tau_0}\,Y_{l'}^{m'}(\mathbf{p}')^* = 4\pi\,i^{l'}\,j_{l'}(k\tau_0)\,Y_{l'}^{m'}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})^*\,. \quad (17)$$

Next, to compute the integral in $d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}$ we note that

$$p^i\, p^j\, \Pi_{ij}{}^{ab}\, \Theta_{ab} = \frac{\sigma}{2}\, v^2\, \Big[2\, p_3^2 - 1 + \hat{k}_3^2 - 4\, p_3\, \hat{k}_3\, (\hat{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{p}) + \Big(1 + \hat{k}_3^2\Big)\, (\hat{\mathbf{k}}\mathbf{p})^2\Big]\ , \quad (18)$$

and use

$$(\hat{\mathbf{k}}\,\mathbf{p})^n e^{-ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\tau_0} = \left(i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial(k\tau_0)}\right)^n e^{-ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\tau_0} \quad (19)$$

to write

$$\int d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}\, p_3^a\, (\hat{\mathbf{k}}\,\mathbf{p})^b\, e^{-ik\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{p}\,\tau_0}\, Y_l^m(\mathbf{p}) = 4\pi \sum_{r,s} i^{b-r}\, j_r^{(b)}(k\tau_0)\, Y_r^s(\hat{\mathbf{k}})\, \mathcal{K}^{(a)}_{rs,lm}\,, \quad (20)$$

where we have defined

$$\mathcal{K}^{(a)}_{rs,lm} \equiv \int d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}\, (p_3)^a\, Y_r^s(\mathbf{p})\, Y_l^m(\mathbf{p})^*\ , \quad (21)$$

with $a = 0, 1, 2$, that can be expressed in terms of Wigner 3-j symbols. All $\mathcal{K}^{(a)}_{rs,lm}$ are proportional to δ_{ms}, with $\mathcal{K}^{(0)}_{rs,lm} = \delta_{lr}\delta_{ms}$, whereas $\mathcal{K}^{(1)}_{rs,lm}$ does not vanish only for $l = r \pm 1$ and $\mathcal{K}^{(2)}_{rs,lm}$ does not vanish only for $l = r \pm 2$ and $l = r$. Then, performing the integral in $d\Omega_{\mathbf{k}}\, d\Omega_{\mathbf{p}}$, we obtain

$$C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,l'm'} = -\frac{\pi}{5}\sigma\, v^2 \int \frac{dx}{x}\, j_{l'}(x) \times \Big\{ \Big[\Big((2 + i^{l'-l})\, \mathcal{K}^{(2)} - \mathcal{K}^{(0)} \Big)\, j_l(x) - \Big(\mathcal{K}^{(0)} + i^{l'-l}\, \mathcal{K}^{(2)} \Big)\, j_l''(x) \Big]_{l'm',lm} - 4 \sum_{rs} i^{l'-r+1} \mathcal{K}^{(1)}_{l'm',rs}\, \mathcal{K}^{(1)}_{rs,lm}\, j_r'(x) \Big\} + (\text{h.c.},\ lm \leftrightarrow l'm')\ . \quad (22)$$

From the properties of $\mathcal{K}^{(n)}_{rs,lm}$ follows that only $C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,lm}$ and $C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,l+2m} = C^{\rm corr}_{l+2m\,lm}$ do not vanish. An explicit calculation gives, for the off-diagonal terms

$$C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,l+2m} = \frac{2\,\pi}{75}\, \frac{\sigma\, v^2}{l\,(l+1)}\, \frac{\big(7\,l^2 + 21\,l + 27\big)}{(l+2)\,(l+3)\,(2\,l+3)} \times \sqrt{\frac{((l+1)^2 - m^2)\,((l+2)^2 - m^2)}{(2\,l+1)(2\,l+5)}}\ , \quad (23)$$

whereas the diagonal terms are

$$C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,lm} = \frac{2\pi}{45}\, \frac{\sigma\, v^2}{l\,(l+1)\,(4\,l^2 + 4\,l - 3)} \times \big(2\,l(l+1)\,(7 - 10(-1)^m) - 15\,(1 - (-1)^m) + 18\,m^2\big)\ . \quad (24)$$

Therefore, defining the usual C_l coefficients as $C_l^{\rm corr} = \frac{1}{(2\,l+1)} \sum_m C^{\rm corr}_{lm\,lm}$, we obtain

$$C_l^{\rm corr} = \frac{2\pi}{9}\, \frac{\sigma\, v^2}{l(l+1)} \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^l}{2\,l+1}\right)\ . \quad (25)$$

To sum up, for $l \gg 1$, the total amplitude of the temperature anisotropies at large scales is

$$\frac{l\,(l+1)}{2\pi}\, C_l \simeq \frac{\mathcal{P}_\zeta}{25} \left(1 + \frac{5}{6}\, r + \frac{25\,\sigma}{9}\, \frac{v^2}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta}\right)\ , \quad (26)$$

that displays a degeneracy between the tensor-to-scalar ratio r and the parameter $\sigma\, v^2$. In particular, for any given r, if $\sigma = -1$ and $v^2 \simeq r \times \frac{3}{10}\, \mathcal{P}_\zeta$, a measurement of $\langle TT \rangle$ would be interpreted as $r = 0$ under the assumption of uncorrelated tensor and scalar modes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The BICEP2 experiment has detected a $B-$mode polarization signal in the CMB that can be explained by a lensed-ΛCDM + tensor theoretical model, with tensor/scalar ratio $r = 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$. While keeping in mind that the central value can be reduced from more statistics or from the subtraction of the dust-polarized signal, we discussed some possible mechanism that may explain how $r = 0.2$ can be reconciled with the upper limits on tensor modes from the temperature anisotropies measurements.

A possible way to reconcile this discrepancy is already offered in the Planck [2] and the BICEP2 [1] analyses, where a running of the spectral tilt is advocated. However, if the central value $r = 0.2$ will be confirmed, the required magnitude of the running is significantly greater than the generic slow-roll predictions. Motivated by this, we discussed two alternative possibilities for suppressing the large scales temperature anisotropies.

The first possibility involves a large scale suppression in the scalar power. This can for instance be achieved if the inflaton zero mode has a greater speed, or if the inflaton perturbations have a larger speed of sound, when the largest observable scales are produced. This resembles the study of [21], in which the power at very large drops to a negligible value due to a period of kinetic dominated regime at the beginning of the beginning of the last $\sim 60\, e$-folds of inflation. Contrary to that case, here we study the possibility that a partial drop of scalar power occurs at scales that are larger than but comparable to the first acoustic peak. The best fit to the temperature data is obtained for a transition scale $k_* \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3}\,{\rm Mpc}^{-1}$, with a $\simeq 35\%$ decrease in power. This fit improves over the Planck ones with conventional models due to the suppression in power in the $10 \lesssim \ell \lesssim 30$ region. Moreover, the model easily fits the tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \sim 0.2$ observed by BICEP2. Quite interestingly, the χ^2 of the fit of this model to the Planck+WP+BICEP2 data improves by about ~ 10 with respect to the fit of the same data of a model with constant running. This is a considerable improvement, given that the suppression model has only one more parameter than the model with a constant running.

The second possibility is a negative correlation between tensor and scalar modes. This requires breaking of Lorenz invariance, which could be achieved for example

from a large scale condense of a field that has spin higher than zero. Besides decreasing the C_ℓ coefficients of the temperature anisotropies, such a correlation would also induce a breaking of statistical invariance at the largest scales (namely, at the scales in which the tensor signal is relevant).

If the goal of the cross correlation is to reduce the impact of the tensor modes on the temperature anisotropies from $\sim 20\%$ to $\sim 10\%$, it should amount to $\sim 10\%$ of the total power. Therefore, we predict a $\lesssim \mathrm{O}(0.1)$ amount of statistical anisotropy in this mechanism, only at the largest scales. This is precisely what appears to be present in the WMAP [33] and in the Planck [34] temperature data, and it is not straightforward to obtain this using scalar fields only (see for instance [35]). In our opinion, this deserves further investigation.

Acknowledgements

We thank Shaul Hanany, Clement Pryke, Gianmassimo Tasinato for very useful discussions. The work of M.P. was partially supported by DOE grant DE-FG02-94ER-40823 at the University of Minnesota. The work of L.S. was partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation grant PHY-1205986.

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [BICEP2 Collaboration], arXiv:1403.3985 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5082 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] A. Kosowsky and M. S. Turner, "CBR anisotropy and the running of the scalar spectral index," Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 1739 [astro-ph/9504071].
[4] D. J. H. Chung, G. Shiu and M. Trodden, "Running of the scalar spectral index from inflationary models," Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 063501 [astro-ph/0305193].
[5] R. Easther and H. Peiris, "Implications of a Running Spectral Index for Slow Roll Inflation," JCAP **0609**, 010 (2006) [astro-ph/0604214].
[6] S. Hannestad, S. H. Hansen and F. L. Villante, "Probing the power spectrum bend with recent CMB data," Astropart. Phys. **16**, 137 (2001) [astro-ph/0012009].
[7] B. Feng, M. -z. Li, R. -J. Zhang and X. -m. Zhang, "An inflation model with large variations in spectral index," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103511 (2003) [astro-ph/0302479].
[8] T. Kobayashi and F. Takahashi, "Running Spectral Index from Inflation with Modulations," JCAP **1101**, 026 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3988 [astro-ph.CO]].
[9] F. Takahashi, "The Spectral Index and its Running in Axionic Curvaton," JCAP **1306**, 013 (2013) [arXiv:1301.2834, arXiv:1301.2834 [astro-ph.CO]].
[10] M. Kawasaki, M. Yamaguchi and J. 'i. Yokoyama, "Inflation with a running spectral index in supergravity," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 023508 (2003) [hep-ph/0304161].
[11] Q. -G. Huang and M. Li, "CMB power spectrum from noncommutative space-time," JHEP **0306**, 014 (2003) [hep-th/0304203].
[12] M. Bastero-Gil, K. Freese and L. Mersini-Houghton, "What can WMAP tell us about the very early universe? New physics as an explanation of suppressed large scale power and running spectral index," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 123514 (2003) [hep-ph/0306289].
[13] M. Yamaguchi and J. 'i. Yokoyama, "Chaotic hybrid new inflation in supergravity with a running spectral index," Phys. Rev. D **68**, 123520 (2003) [hep-ph/0307373].
[14] G. Ballesteros, J. A. Casas and J. R. Espinosa, "Running spectral index as a probe of physics at high scales," JCAP **0603**, 001 (2006) [hep-ph/0601134].
[15] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **129**, 177 (1983).
[16] K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and A. V. Olinto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3233 (1990).
[17] J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles and M. Peloso, JCAP **0501**, 005 (2005) [hep-ph/0409138].
[18] N. Kaloper, A. Lawrence and L. Sorbo, JCAP **1103**, 023 (2011) [arXiv:1101.0026 [hep-th]].
[19] N. Kaloper and L. Sorbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 121301 (2009) [arXiv:0811.1989 [hep-th]].
[20] E. Pajer and M. Peloso, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 214002 (2013) [arXiv:1305.3557 [hep-th]].
[21] C. R. Contaldi, M. Peloso, L. Kofman and A. D. Linde, JCAP **0307**, 002 (2003) [astro-ph/0303636].
[22] C. L. Bennett *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 1 (2003) [astro-ph/0302207].
[23] A. D. Linde, JCAP **0305**, 002 (2003) [astro-ph/0303245].
[24] G. Nicholson and C. R. Contaldi, JCAP **0801**, 002 (2008) [astro-ph/0701783].
[25] M. Park and L. Sorbo, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 083520 (2012) [arXiv:1201.2903 [astro-ph.CO]].
[26] A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, C. R. Contaldi and M. Peloso, astro-ph/0608405.
[27] T. S. Pereira, C. Pitrou and J. -P. Uzan, JCAP **0709**, 006 (2007) [arXiv:0707.0736 [astro-ph]].
[28] A. E. Gumrukcuoglu, C. R. Contaldi and M. Peloso, JCAP **0711**, 005 (2007) [arXiv:0707.4179 [astro-ph]].
[29] C. Pitrou, T. S. Pereira and J. -P. Uzan, JCAP **0804**, 004 (2008) [arXiv:0801.3596 [astro-ph]].
[30] Lewis, A., Challinor, A., & Lasenby, A. 2000, Astrophys. J., 538, 473
[31] Lewis, A., & Bridle, S. 2002, Phys. Rev. D, 66, 103511
[32] Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2013, arXiv:1303.5076
[33] H. K. Eriksen, F. K. Hansen, A. J. Banday, K. M. Gorski and P. B. Lilje, Astrophys. J. **605**, 14 (2004) [Erratum-ibid. **609**, 1198 (2004)] [astro-ph/0307507].
[34] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5083 [astro-ph.CO].
[35] G. D'Amico, R. Gobbetti, M. Kleban and M. Schillo, JCAP **1311**, 013 (2013) [arXiv:1306.6872 [astro-ph.CO]].